



Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa : A comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra section

Emilie Aussant

► To cite this version:

Emilie Aussant. Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa : A comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra section. Pascale Haag & Vincenzo Vergiani. Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti. The Section on Pratyāhāras : Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions, Editrice Fiorentina-Manohar, pp.191-214, 2009, 978-88-6032-114-5. halshs-00426727

HAL Id: halshs-00426727

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00426727>

Submitted on 1 Dec 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ÉMILIE AUSSANT

Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa:
*A Comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra Section*¹

Introduction

This paper is devoted to a comparison of the *Pratyāhārasūtra* (psū) section of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with that of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* is a grammar of the Sanskrit language, composed in Sanskrit and intended for Buddhists. Although it has disappeared from the Indian territory, it has been maintained and transmitted in countries where Buddhism became widespread.² The aim of its author, the Buddhist scholar Candragomin, who is thought to have lived around the 4th-5th century CE, is to present an effortless, clear and exhaustive grammar. In fact, it is the first great revised edition of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A.) of Pāṇini: Candra preserves most of the content of the Pāṇinian treatise but forsakes its generative pattern and adopts a thematic scheme. He also incorporates some of Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's suggestions.

The present study is justified in so far as the *Kāśikāvṛtti* shows numerous similarities with the commentary on this grammar (the *Cāndravṛtti*—CV— which was believed for a long time to

¹ I warmly thank Pascale Haag, Vincenzo Vergiani and Thomas Oberlies for their remarks, criticisms and advice. I would also like to thank Saroja Bhate for her help in reading the *Pratyāhārasūtra* section of the C.

² Cf. Balbir (2000: 270-71).

have been composed by Candraraja himself; today some scholars maintain that its author was a certain Dharmadāsa³), even if the *Kāśikāvṛtti* does not make reference to it explicitly. To date, the origin of these similarities has given rise to two main hypotheses. According to one view, defended in particular by R. Vedālakar (1977: 250-69) and P. Visalakshy (1981), the *Kāśikā* was influenced by the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravṛtti*. According to another, both the *Kāśikā* and the *Cāndravṛtti* were inspired by another text: S.D. Joshi, J.A.F. Roodbergen (1991-1992) and J. Bronkhorst (especially 2002: 185-195) believe that this common source probably belonged to the Pāṇinian tradition; T. Oberlies (1996: 285-86) thinks that it was rather a lost commentary on the *Jainendravvyākaraṇa*.

The study of the *psū* section of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with its *vṛtti*, compared to that of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, confirms the existence of numerous similarities between the two texts; very few elements of the *Cāndravṛtti* are not found in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. In order to grasp somewhat better the peculiarities of this parallelism, I have examined the divergences shown by the two texts: for what reasons do they differ in some passages?

As I will try to show in this paper, some divergences can be explained very simply. This is particularly the case of the differences related to the reference text (cf. 2.2): the *Cāndravṛtti* refers to Candraraja's *sūtras*, whereas the *Kāśikāvṛtti* refers to Pāṇini's. This is also the case of the differences in vocabulary (cf. 2.2 "Other divergences"): it is indeed well-known⁴ that the technical terminology used by Candraraja differs considerably from the one used by Pāṇini. It is more difficult to justify some other divergences, like the presence or the absence of sequences or of sentences. The third part of this paper is essentially devoted to this kind of problems.

1. *Presentation of the psū section of the two texts*

Some details concerning the conventions adopted in this paper:

- a) underlined types indicate that the sequence in question differs in both texts;
- b) bold-faced types indicate that the sequence in question is found in both texts but in different places;

³ Cf. Dash (1986: 17-21), Oberlies (1996: 267; 2006: 380-81). For a different view on this issue, cf. Bronkhorst (2002: 182-85).

⁴ Cf. Dash (1980; 1986: 54-62).

c) the numbering [1] etc. corresponds to the one adopted for the present critical edition of the psū section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*;

d) in tables 2.1 and 2.2, the = symbol indicates a correspondence, the ≠ symbol indicates a non-correspondence;

e) abbreviations:

[SS]: several missing sentences

[S]: missing sentence

[W]: missing word

[EX]: missing example

[SU]: missing *sūtra*;

f) reference edition of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravṛtti*: *Cāndra-vṛtti, der original Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*, herausgegeben von Bruno Liebich, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 14, Leipzig, 1918 [reprint: Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendeln, 1966];

g) reference edition of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: the critical edition presented in this book.

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[1] <i>siddham praṇamya sarvajñaṃ sarpvīyaṃ jagato gurum. laghuviśpaṣṭasampūrṇam ucyate śabdalakṣaṇam.</i></p>	<p>[1] <i>vṛtau bhāṣye tathā dhātunāmapārāyaṇādiṣu. viprakīrṇasya tantrasya kriyate sārasamgrahah 1 </i></p>
<p>[2] [SS] <i>atha kimartha varṇānām upadeśaḥ? pratyāhārārthaḥ. pratyāhāro hi lāghavena sāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ.</i></p>	<p>[2] <i>atha śabdānuśāsanam. keśām śabdānām? laukikānām vaidikānāmca.kathamānuśāsanam? prakṛtyādivibhāgaparikalpanayā sāmānyaviśeṣavatā lakṣaṇena. atha kimartha varṇānām upadeśaḥ? pratyāhārārthaḥ. pratyāhāro [W] lāghavena sāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ.</i></p>
<p>[3] a i u ṇ 1 <i>a i u ity anena krameṇa varṇān upadiśyānte ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavaty ekena: ṛko 'ṇo ralāu [C. 1.1.15] ity akāreṇa. jātinirdeśaś cāyam.</i></p>	<p>[3] a i u ṇ 1 <i>a i u ity anena krameṇa varṇān upadiśyānte ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavaty ekena ur aṇ raparaḥ [A 1.1.52] ity akāreṇa. [S]</i></p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[4] [SS] r ḷ ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte kakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭam. tasyoccāraṇam bhavati caturbhiḥ: ako 'ki dīrgha [C 5.1.106] ity akāreṇa, <u>iko yan</u> <u>aci</u> [C. 5.1.74] itikāreṇa, <u>ugita</u> [C. 5.2.44] ity ukāreṇa, <u>iko 'no ralāv</u> [C. 1.1.15] ity rkāreṇa.</p>	<p>[4] <u>hrasvam avarṇam prayoge samvrtam.</u> <u>dīrghaphlutaḥ tu vivrtatvam. teṣāṃ</u> <u>sāvarṇyaprasiddhyartham akāra</u> <u>iha śāstre vivrtah pratijñāyate. tasya</u> <u>prayogārtham a a</u> [A. 8.4.68] <u>iti</u> <u>śāstrānte pratyāpattiḥ karisyate.</u></p>
<p>[5] r ḷ k 2 r ḷ ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte kakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭam. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati tribhiḥ. akāḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ [A. 6.1.101] ity akāreṇa, <u>iko guṇavṛddhi</u> [A. 1.1.3] itikāreṇa, <u>ugitāś ca</u> [A. 4.1.6] ity ukāreṇa [SU] </p>	<p>[5] r ḷ k 2 r ḷ ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte kakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭam. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati tribhiḥ. akāḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ [A. 6.1.101] ity akāreṇa, <u>iko guṇavṛddhi</u> [A. 1.1.3] itikāreṇa, <u>ugitāś ca</u> [A. 4.1.6] ity ukāreṇa [SU] </p>
<p>[6] akārādayo varṇāḥ pracuraprayogaviśayās, teṣāṃ sujñānam upadeśaprayojanam. lkāras tu klpistha eva prayujyate, klpeś ca pūrvatrāsiddham [C. 6.3.27] iti latvam asiddham, <u>tata</u> <u>rkāra evāckāryāṇi bhaviṣyantīti kim</u> <u>artham lkāra upadiśyate?</u></p>	<p>[6] akārādayo varṇāḥ pracuraprayogaviśayās teṣāṃ sujñānam upadeśe prayojanam. lkāras tu klpistha eva prayujyate. klpeś ca pūrvatrāsiddham [A. 8.2.1] iti latvam asiddham, <u>tatra</u> <u>rkāra evāckāryāṇi bhaviṣyantīti kim</u> <u>artham lkāra upadiśyate?</u></p>
<p>[7] latvavidhānād yāni parāṇy ackāryāṇi tāny lkāre yathā syur iti. kāni punas tāni? <u>plutaḥ svarito</u> <u>dvirvacanam ca: kṛ3ptaśikha,</u> <u>prakṛptaḥ, kṛpptavān iti.</u></p>	<p>[7] latvavidhānād yāni parāṇy ackāryāṇi tāny lkāre yathā syur iti. kāni punas tāni. <u>plutaḥ, svaritah,</u> <u>dvirvacanam</u> [W]. <u>kṛ3ptaśikhaḥ,</u> <u>prakṛptaḥ, kṛpptavān iti.</u></p>
<p>[8] yac cāsaktijam asādhu śabdārūpaṃ tadanukarāṇasyāpi sādhutvam iṣyate; tatsthasyāpy lkārasyāckāryapratipattiyartham upadeśahkriyate. <u>ṛtakaitiprayoktavye</u> <u>śaktivaikalyāt kumāryā</u> <u>ṛtaka iti</u> <u>prayuktaḥ. tam</u> anyo 'nukaroti: kumāry <u>ṛtaka itiyam</u> āheti.</p>	<p>[8] yac cāsaktijam asādhuśabdarūpaṃ <u>t a d a n u k a r a ṇ a s y ā p i</u> sādhutvam iṣyate. tatsthasyāpy lkārasyāckāryapratipattiyartham upadeśahkriyate. <u>ṛtakaitiprayoktavye</u> <u>śaktivaikalyāt kumāry</u> <u>ṛtaka iti</u> <u>prayuṅkte, tad</u> anyo 'nukaroti kumāry <u>ṛtaka ity</u> [W] āheti.</p>
<p>[9] e o ṇ 3 e o ity etau varṇāv upadiśyānte nakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭam. tasyoccāraṇam bhavaty ekena: <u>iko 'deṇ</u> <u>kriyārthāyā</u> [C. 6.2.1] ity ekāreṇa.</p>	<p>[9] e o ṇ 3 e o ity etau varṇāv upadiśyānte nakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭam. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavaty ekena <u>eṇi</u> <u>pararūpaṃ</u> [A. 6.1.94] ity ekāreṇa.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[10] ai au c 4 ai au ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte cakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭham. tasyoccāranam bhavati caturbhiḥ: <u>aca</u> <u>ādaij</u>hetur <u>araktavikāra</u> [C. 5.2.36] ity akāreṇa, khitica ekāco 'ma [C. 5.2.4] itikāreṇa, eco 'yavāyāva [C. 5.1.75] ity ekāreṇa, <u>ajāgrniśvīnām</u> <u>sicy</u> <u>atany</u> <u>ādaij</u> [C. 6.1.3] ity aikāreṇa.</p>	<p>[10] ai au c 4 ai au ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte cakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati caturbhiḥ. <u>acah</u> <u>parasmin</u> <u>pūrvavidhau</u> [A. 1.1.57] ity akāreṇa, <u>ica</u> <u>ekāco</u> 'm pratyayavac ca [A. 6.3.68] itikāreṇa, eco 'yavāyāvaḥ [A. 6.1.78] ity ekāreṇa, <u>vṛddhir</u> <u>ādaic</u> [A. 1.1.1] ity aikāreṇa.</p>
<p>[11] pratyāhāre 'nubandhānām katham ajgrahaṇeṣu na ? <u>jñāpakād</u> <u>apradhānatvāl</u> <u>lopaś</u> <u>ca</u> <u>balavān</u> <u>iti</u>.</p>	<p>[11] pratyāhāre 'nubandhānām katham ajgrahaṇeṣu na. <u>ācārād</u> <u>apradhānatvāl</u> <u>lopaś</u> <u>ca</u> <u>balavattarah</u> [W].</p>
<p>[12] varṇeṣu ye varṇaikadeśā varṇāntarasamānākṛtayaś teṣu tatkāryaṃ na bhavati, tacchāyānukāriṇo hi te na punas ta eva; prthakprayatnanirvartyaṃ hi varṇam icchanty ācāryāḥ.</p>	<p>[12] varṇeṣu ye varṇaikadeśā varṇāntara-samānākṛtayaś teṣu tatkāryaṃ na bhavati. tacchāyānukāriṇo hi te, na punas ta eva. prthakprayatna-nirvartyaṃ hi varṇam icchanty ācāryāḥ.</p>
<p>[13] <u>nugvidhilādeśanatesu</u> <u>ṛkāre</u> <u>pratividhātavyam</u>.</p>	<p>[13] <u>nudvidhilādeśavināmesu</u> <u>ṛkāre</u> <u>pratividhātavyam</u>.</p>
<p>[14] ha ya va ra <u>la</u> <u>n</u> 5 ha ya va ra <u>la</u> ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte <u>nakāram</u> itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭham. tasyoccāranam bhavati <u>dvābhyām</u>: <u>inaḥ</u> <u>sa</u> [C. 6.4.34] <u>itikāreṇa</u>, <u>iko</u> <u>yaṇ</u> <u>aci</u> [C. 5.1.74] <u>iti yakāreṇa</u>. <u>ingrahaṇāni</u> <u>sarvāny</u> <u>anena</u> <u>nakāreṇa</u>, <u>angrahaṇāni</u> <u>tu pūrvena</u> <u>nakāreṇa</u>. <u>jātinirdeśaś</u> <u>cāyam</u> [SU].</p>	<p>[14] ha ya va ra <u>t</u> 5 ha ya va ra [W] ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte <u>takāram</u> itaṃ karoti pratyāhārāṣṭham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavaty <u>ekena</u> <u>śaś</u> <u>cho</u> 'ti [A. 8.4.63] <u>ity akāreṇa</u>. [SU] [SS]</p>
<p>[15] ayaṃ repho yakārāt para upadiśyate. tasya yarupādāne yayupādāne <u>yamupādāne</u> <u>copādāne</u> sati [EX] prātar nayatīty atra yaro nāmi nām vā [C. 6.4.140] iti <u>nāmādeśaḥ</u> prāpnoti, [EX] <u>nadihrada</u> ity atrāco <u>rahād</u> dve [C. 6.4.141] iti dvīrvacanam prāpnoti, [EX] <u>naram</u> <u>rathenety</u> atrānusvārasya yayi yam [C. 6.4.151] <u>iti yamādeśaḥ</u> prāpnoti.</p>	<p>[15] ayaṃ repho yakārāt para upadiśyate. ta- sya yargrahanena yaygrahanena [W] <u>ca</u> <u>grahane</u> sati <u>svar</u> <u>nayati</u> prātar nayatīty atra yaro 'anunāsike 'anunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] <u>ity anunāsikaḥ</u> prāpnoti, <u>madrahrado</u> <u>bhadrahada</u> ity atrāco <u>rahābhyām</u> dve [A. 8.4.46] iti dvīrvacanam prāpnoti. <u>kundam</u> <u>rath-</u> <u>ena</u>, <u>vanam</u> <u>rathenety</u> atrānusvārasya yayi <u>parasavamaḥ</u> [A. 8.4.58] <u>iti</u> <u>parasavamaḥ</u> prāpnoti.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[16] <i>naiṣa doṣaḥ. ākṛtau padārthe samudāye sakṛl <u>lakṣye</u> lakṣaṇaṃ pravartata iti [W] darśane yaro ṇami ṇam veti <u>ṇam</u> <u>pratyāsannataro</u> bhavatiṭy evam etat pravartate tad anena gākārādīnāṃ ṇākārādayo ye yathāsvaṃ sthānato guṇataś ca <u>pratyāsannatarāś</u> te vihitāḥ. ye <u>ca</u> na sthānato nāpi guṇataś <u>ca</u> sthānamātreṇa guṇamātreṇa <u>ca</u> [W] te sarve nivartitā iti sthānamātreṇa <u>pratyāsanno</u> rephasya ṇakāro na bhavati. dvirvacane 'pi rephasya yarantarbhāve 'pi sati <u>yat kārṇitvam</u> prāptam tat sāksāc chiṣṭena nimittabhāvena bādhyata iti na dvir ucyate rephaḥ. anusvārasya yayi yam ity etad <u>apy</u> anusvārasya <u>nimittapratyāsannatarām</u> sakṛd eva <u>yamam</u> vidadhāti. na ca rephasya <u>nimittasyānunāsikah</u> <u>pratyāsannataro</u> 'astīti na bhaviṣyati [EX] <u>naram</u> <u>rathenety</u> atra.</i></p>	<p>[16] <i>naiṣa doṣaḥ, ākṛtau padārthe samudāye sakṛl [W] lakṣaṇaṃ pravartata ity <u>etasmīn</u> darśane yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] [W] <u>antaratamo</u> bhavatiṭy evam etat pravartate. tad anena gākārādīnāṃ ṇākārādayo ye yathāsvaṃ sthānato guṇataś <u>cāntaratamās</u> te vihitāḥ. ye <u>tu</u> na sthānato nāpi guṇataḥ [W], sthānamātreṇa guṇamātreṇa <u>vā</u> <u>antaratamās</u> te sarve nivartitā iti sthānamātr<u>antaratamo</u> rephasya ṇakāro na bhavati. dvirvacane 'pi rephasya yarantarbhāve [W] sati <u>yarkāryam</u> prāptam, tat sāksāc chiṣṭena nimittabhāvena bādhyata iti na dvir ucyate rephaḥ. anusvārasya yayi <u>parasavarṇaḥ</u> [A. 8.4.58] ity etad <u>apy</u> anusvār<u>antaratamam</u> sakṛd eva <u>parasavarṇam</u> vidadhāti. na ca rephasyā<u>anusvārantaratamah</u> <u>savarṇo</u> 'stīti na bhaviṣyati <u>kundam</u> <u>rathena</u>, <u>vanam</u> <u>rathenety</u> atra.</i></p>
<p>[17] <i><u>atra</u> <u>hakārādiṣv</u> <u>akāra</u> <u>uccāranārthaḥ</u>, <u>anyatra</u> <u>prayojanābhāvāt</u>, <u>halām</u> <u>api</u> <u>jātinirdeśāt</u>. [SS]</i></p> <p>[18] [SS]</p>	<p>[17] [S] <u>atām</u> <u>madhye</u> <u>visarjanī-</u> <u>yajihvāmūlyopadhmānīyānām</u> <u>apy</u> <u>upadeśaḥ</u> <u>kartavyaḥ</u>. <u>kim</u> <u>prayojanam?</u> <u>urah</u> <u>kena</u>, <u>urah</u> <u>kena</u>, <u>urah</u> <u>pena</u>, <u>urah</u> <u>pena</u>, <u>atra</u> <u>advyavāye</u> [A. 8.4.2] <u>iti</u> <u>natvam</u> <u>yathā</u> <u>syād</u> <u>iti</u>.</p> <p>[18] <u>lan</u> 6 <u>la</u> <u>ity</u> <u>ekam</u> <u>varṇam</u> <u>upadiśya</u> <u>pūrvāśś</u> <u>cānte</u> <u>nakāram</u> <u>itam</u> <u>karoti</u> <u>pratyāhārārtham</u>. <u>tasya</u> <u>grahanam</u> <u>bhavati</u> <u>tribhiḥ</u>. <u>anudīti</u> <u>savarṇasya</u> <u>cāpratyayaḥ</u> [A. 1.1.69] <u>ity</u> <u>akāreṇa</u>, <u>inkoh</u> [A. 8.3.57] <u>itikāreṇa</u>, <u>iko</u> <u>yan</u> <u>aci</u> [A. 6.1.77] <u>iti</u> <u>yakāreṇa</u>.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
[19] [SS]	[19] <i>ingrahaṇāni sarvāṇi pareṇa ṇakāreṇa. angrahaṇāni tu pūrveṇa</i> [W], <i>anuditsavarnasya cāpratyayah</i> [A. 1.1.69] <i>ity etad ekam anena.</i>
[20] [SS]	[20] <i>atha kim artham ajgrahanam evaitan na kriyate? naiṣam śakyam. antahsthanām api hi savarnānām grahanam isyate saṃśyāntā. saṃśvatsarah. yātllokam. tātllokam ity atrānusuvarasyānunāsike yayi parasavarṇe kṛte tasya yagrahaṇeṇa grahanād dvirvacanam yathā syād iti.</i>
[21] [SS]	[21] [W] <i>hakārādiṣṭv akāra uccāraṇārthah, nānubandhah. lakāre tvanunāsika itsamjñakah pratijñāyate, tena uran raparah</i> [A. 1.1.51] <i>ity atra pratyāhāragrahaṇāl laparatvam api bhavati.</i>
[22] ṇa ma ṇa ṇa na m 6 <i>ṇa ma ṇa ṇa na ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte makāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccarāṇam bhavati pañcabhiḥ: śaś cho 'mi</i> [C. 6.4.157] <i>ity akāreṇa, anusvārasya yayi yam</i> [C. 6.4.151] <i>iti yakāreṇa, yaro ṇami ṇam vā</i> [C. 6.4.140] <i>iti ṇakāreṇa</i> [S], <i>vinmator mam iti makāreṇa, ṇamo</i> hrasvād dve [C. 6.4.17] <i>iti ṇakāreṇa.</i>	[22] ṇa ma ṇa ṇa na m 7 <i>ṇa ma ṇa ṇa na ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte makāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahaṇam bhavati tribhiḥ. pumaḥ khayy ampare</i> [A 8.3.6] <i>ity akāreṇa, halo yamām yami lopah</i> [A. 8.4.64] <i>iti yakāreṇa, [SU] ṇamo</i> hrasvād <i>aci ṇamuṇ nityam</i> [A. 8.3.32] <i>iti ṇakāreṇa. ṇamantād dah</i> [US 1.111] <i>iti ṇakāreṇāpi grahaṇam asya drśyate.</i>
[23] <i>ke cit tu sarvāṇy etāni pratyāhāragrahaṇāni ṇakāreṇa bhavantu iti makārānubandham pratyācakṣate. tathā ca sati ṇamo</i> hrasvād dve [C. 6.4.17] <i>iti</i> [W] <i>dvitvabhājor jhabhor abhāvād dvitvābhāvapratipattau pratipattigauravaṃ syāt.</i>	[23] <i>ke cit tu sarvāṇy etāni pratyāhāragrahaṇāni ṇakāreṇa bhavantu iti makāram anubandham pratyācakṣate. tathā ca sati ṇamo hrasvād aci ṇamuṇ nityam</i> [A. 8.3.32] <i>ity atrāgaminor jhabhor abhāvād āgamābhāvapratipattau pratipattigauravaṃ bhavati.</i>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[24] jha bha ñ 7 jha bha ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte ñakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavaty ekena: ata ād yañi [C. 6.2.39] iti yakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[24] jha bha ñ 8 jha bha ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte ñakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavaty ekena. ato dīrghaḥ yañi [A. 7.3.101] iti yakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[25] gha ḍha dha ṣ 8 gha ḍha dha ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavati dvābhyām: jhaṣa ekācaḥ sdhvor baśo bhaṣ [C. 6.3.69] iti <u>jhakārabhakārābhyām</u>.</p>	<p>[25] gha ḍha dha ṣ 9 gha ḍha dha ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati dvābhyām. ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvoḥ [A. 8.2.37] iti <u>bhakārajhakārābhyām</u>.</p>
<p>[26] ja ba ga ḍa da ś 9 ja ba ga ḍa da ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavati <u>pañcabhiḥ</u>: bhobhagoaghobhyo 'śi lopa [C 6.4.24] ity akāreṇa, haśi cāto ror [C. 5.1.119] iti hakāreṇa, vaśi [C. 5.4.128] iti vakāreṇa, <u>jhalo jaś</u> [C. 6.3.67] iti jakāreṇa [W], jhaṣa ekācaḥ sdhvor baśo bhaṣ [C. 6.3.69] iti bakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[26] ja ba ga ḍa da ś 10 ja ba ga ḍa da ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati <u>śaddbhiḥ</u>. bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yo 'śi [A. 8.3.17] ity akāreṇa, haśi ca [A. 6.1.114] iti hakāreṇa, neḍvaśi kṛti [A. 7.2.8.] iti vakāreṇa, <u>jhalām jaś jhaśi</u> [A. 8.4.53] iti jakārajhakārābhyām, ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvoḥ [A. 8.2.37] iti bakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[27] kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta v 10 kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta ity etān varṇān upadiśyānte vakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavaty ekena: naś chavy apraśān [C. 6.4.3] iti chakāreṇa. khaphagrahaṇam uttarārtham.</p>	<p>[27] kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta v 11 kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta ity etān varṇān upadiśyānte vakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavaty. ekena naś chavy apraśān [A. 8.3.7] iti chakāreṇa. khaphagrahaṇam uttarārtham.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[28] ka pa y 11 ka pa ity etau varṇāu upadiśya pūrvāms cānte yakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavati <u>pañcabhiḥ</u>: anusvārasya yayi yam [C. 6.4.151] iti yakāreṇa, maya uño 'ci va [C. 6.4.16] iti makāreṇa, jhayo ho jhay [C. 6.4.156] iti jhakāreṇa, pumaḥ khayy ami [C. 6.4.2] iti khakāreṇa, <u>cayah śari</u> <u>dvitiya</u> [C. 6.4.158] iti cakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[28] ka pa y 12 ka pa ity etau varṇāu upadiśya pūrvāms cānte yakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati <u>caturbhiḥ</u>. anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ [A. 8.4.58] iti yakāreṇa, maya uño vo vā [A. 8.3.33] iti makāreṇa, jhayo ho 'anyatarasyām [A. 8.4.62] iti jhakāreṇa, pumaḥ khayy ampare [A. 8.3.6] iti khakāreṇa. [SU]</p>
<p>[29] śa śa sa r 12 śa śa sa ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte repḥam itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavati <u>pañcabhiḥ</u>: yaro ṇami ṇam vā [C. 6.4.140] iti yakāreṇa, halo jharām jhari sasthāne loḥo vā [C. 6.4.155] iti jhakāreṇa, khari car jhala [C. 6.4.148] iti khakāra [SU] [W] <u>cakārābhyām</u>, <u>ṇṇoḥ kuktukau</u> <u>śari</u> [C. 6.4.12] iti śakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[29] śa śa sa r 13 śa śa sa ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte repḥam itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati <u>pañcabhiḥ</u>. yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] iti yakāreṇa, jharo jhari savarṇe [A. 8.4.65] iti jhakāreṇa, khari ca [A. 8.4.55] iti khakāreṇa, <u>abhyāse car ca</u> [A. 8.4.54] iti cakāreṇa, <u>śarpūrvāḥ</u> <u>khayah</u> [A. 7.4.61] iti śakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[30] ha l 13 ha ity ekaṃ varṇam upadiśya pūrvāms cānte lakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasy<u>occāranam</u> bhavati <u>ṣaḍbhiḥ</u>: <u>śidaneḥāl sarvasya</u> [C. 1.1.12] ity akāreṇa, <u>hali pity</u> <u>uta aud</u> [C. 6.2.30] iti hakāreṇa, <u>supi vali tadvad</u> [C. 6.3.51] iti vakāreṇa, ralo halāder idutoḥ sani ca [C. 6.2.21] iti repḥena, jhalo jhali [C. 6.3.55] iti jhakāreṇa, śala igupāntād adrso 'niṭaḥ ksa [C. 1.1.65] iti śakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[30] ha l 14 ha ity ekaṃ varṇam upadiśya pūrvāms cānte lakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati <u>ṣaḍbhiḥ</u>. <u>alo 'ntyāt pūrva</u> <u>upadhā</u> [A. 1.1.65] ity akāreṇa, <u>halo</u> <u>'nantarāḥ samyogah</u> [A. 1.1.7] iti hakāreṇa, <u>loḥo vyor vali</u> [A. 6.1.66] iti vakāreṇa, ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ sams' ca [A. 1.2.26] iti repḥena, jhalo jhali [A. 8.2.26] iti jhakāreṇa, śala igupadhād anīṭaḥ ksaḥ [A. 3.1.45] iti śakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[31] atha kimartham upadiśto 'py <u>ayam</u> hakārah punar upadiśyate? <u>adeṇvikalpaksavidhā</u> <u>idvidhaya</u> yathā syur iti.</p>	<p>[31] atha kimartham upadiśto 'pi [W] <u>hakārah</u> punar upadiśyate? <u>kittva</u> [W] ksa [W] <u>idvidhaya</u> yathā syur iti.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[32] <i>tatra snihitvā snehitvety atra ralo halāderidutoḥ sani ca</i> [C. 6.2.21] <i>ity adenvikalpo yathā syāt, liheś cālikṣad iti śala igupāntād adṛśo 'niṭaḥ ksa</i> [C. 1.1.65] <i>iti kso yathā syāt, rudihi svapihiti valādilakṣaṇād id yathā syāt. adāgdhām iti jhalgrahaṇeṣu ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i></p>	<p>[32] <i>[W] snihitvā [EX] ity atra ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ samś ca</i> [A. 1.2.26] <i>iti kittvam yathā syāt. liher [W] alikṣad iti śala igupadhād anīṭaḥ ksaḥ</i> [A. 3.1.45] <i>iti kso yathā syāt, rudihi, svapihiti valādilakṣaṇa id yathā syāt. adāgdhām iti jhalgrahaṇeṣu ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i></p>
<p>[33] <i>ha ya va ra la n ity atra tarhi kimarthaṃ hakāra upadiśyate?</i> [W] <i>aśgrahaṇe [W] haśgrahaṇe ca grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i> [EX][EX] [EX]</p>	<p>[33] <i>ha ya va ra ṭ [pṣū. 5] ity atra tarhi kimarthaṃ [W] upadiśyate?</i> <i>adgrahaṇeṣu aśgrahaṇeṣu ca</i> [W] [W] <i>haśi ceti ca grahaṇam yathā syāt. mahā hi sah, devā hasanti, brāhmano hasati.</i></p>
<p>[34] <i>nañāñāvāḥsyurekasmāc, caturbhyas ca kacau, nasau.</i> <i>dvābhyām jñeyau, pañcabhyo rśmyah, śadbhyo las tu vidhīyate.</i> [S] <i>esa pratyāhārah pūrvavyākaranesu api sthita eva, ayam tu viśeṣah: aiaus iti yad āsit tad aiauj iti krtam. tathā hi: laghāu ante dvayoś ca bahvaśo guruh, tñadhānyānām ca dvyasām</i> [phit-sūtra 2.19.4] <i>iti paṭhyate.</i></p>	<p>[34] <i>ekasmān nañānavatā dvābhyām śas tribhya eva kanamāḥ syuh.</i> <i>jñeyau cayau caturbhyo rah pañcabhyah śalau śadbhyah.</i> <i>iti pratyāhārah.</i> [SS]</p>

2. Types of divergences

I distinguish three types of divergences:

First type: several sentences, a sentence, a word, an example or a *sūtra* are present or absent in one text, but not in the other. This type of divergence becomes clearly visible in the parallel presentation of the two texts: for example, in section [2], the symbol [SS] that appears in the *Cāndravṛtti* text corresponds to the underlined sentence sequence *atha... lakṣaṇena* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* text; the symbol [W] that appears in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* text corresponds to the underlined word *hi* of the *Cāndravṛtti* text.

In this type of divergences, I include the cases of sequences that are in both texts but at different places. These cases, indicated by bold-faced types, are the following: [14 CV] = [18-19 KV] and [17 CV] = [21 KV].

Second type: divergences concerning words of common usage and examples. See table 2.1, part 3.1 (common usage vocabulary) and part 3.2 (examples);

Third type: divergences related to the reference text. See table 2.2, part 3.1 and part 3.3.

2.1 Common usage vocabulary, examples

CV	KV	Localization
<i>uccāraṇam</i>	<i>grahaṇam</i>	[3], [5], [9], [10], [14], [22], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]
<i>tataḥ</i>	<i>tatra</i>	[6]
<i>kumāryā... prayuktaḥ</i>	<i>kumārī... prayuñkte</i>	[8]
<i>tam</i>	<i>tad</i>	[8]
<i>jñāpakāt</i>	<i>acārāt</i>	[11]
<i>balavān</i>	<i>balavattaraḥ</i>	[11]
<i>anena</i>	<i>pareṇa</i>	[14 CV]=[18-19 KV]
<i>upādāne × 4</i>	<i>grahaṇa- × 3</i>	[15]
<i>ca</i>	<i>tu</i>	[16]
<i>ca</i>	<i>vā</i>	[16]
<i>yat kāryitvam</i>	<i>yarkāryam</i>	[16]
<i>syāt</i>	<i>bhavati</i>	[23]
<i>valādīlakṣaṇād id</i>	<i>valādīlakṣaṇa id</i>	[32]

2.2 Divergences related to the reference text (KV→A.; CV→C.)

Numer of possible combination of the <i>anubandhas</i>		<i>sūtras</i> quoted		Other divergences		Loc.
CV	KV	CV	KV	CV	KV	
4	3	5.1.106 = 6.1.101 5.1.74 ≠ 1.1.3 5.2.44 ≠ 4.1.6 1.1.15				[5]
1	1	6.2.1 ≠ 6.1.94				[9]
4	4	5.2.36 ≠ 1.1.57 5.2.4 = 6.3.68 5.1.75 = 6.1.78 6.1.3 ≠ 1.1.1				[10]
				<i>nug ṇatveṣu</i>	<i>nuḍ vināmeṣu</i>	[13]
2	1	6.4.34 ≠ 8.4.63 5.1.74		<i>hayavaralaṇ hayavarala ṇakāram</i>	<i>hayavaraṇ hayavara ṭakāram</i>	[14]
				<i>yamuṇpādāne ṇamādesaḥ yamādesaḥ</i>	<i>anunāsikaḥ parasavarṇaḥ</i>	[15]
				<i>ṇaṇ pratyāsannataraḥ pratyāsannatarāḥ sthānamātreṇa pratyāsannaḥ anusvārasya nimittapratyāsannataram yamam nimittasyānunāsikaḥ pratyāsannataraḥ</i>	<i>antaratamaḥ antaratamāḥ sthānamātrāntaratamaḥ anusvārāntaratamam parasavarṇam anusvārāntaratamaḥ savarṇaḥ</i>	[16]
5	3	6.4.157 ≠ 8.3.6 6.4.151 ≠ 8.4.64 6.4.140 Vedic <i>sū.</i> ¹ 6.4.17 = 8.3.32				[22]
				<i>dviṭvabhājor dviṭva°</i>	<i>āgaminor āgama°</i>	[23]
				<i>jhakārabhakārābhyām</i>	<i>bhakārābjhakārābhyām</i>	[25]

¹ This *sūtra* does not have any reference. According to the editor K.C. Chatterji (p. 7), it could be a rule of the Vedic section that has not been discovered yet

Numer of possible combination of the <i>anubandhas</i>		<i>sūtras</i> quoted	Other divergences		Loc.:
CV	KV		CV	KV	
5	4	6.4.151 = 8.4.58 6.4.16 = 8.3.33 6.4.156 = 8.4.62 6.4.2 = 8.3.6 6.4.158			[28]
5	5	6.4.140 = 8.4.45 6.4.155 = 8.4.65 6.4.148 = 8.4.55 6.4.148 8.4.54 6.4.12 = 7.4.61			[29]
6	6	1.1.12 = 1.1.65 6.2.30 = 1.1.7 6.3.51 = 6.1.66 6.2.21 = 1.2.26 6.3.55 = 8.2.26 1.1.65 = 3.1.45			[30]
			<i>adeṇvikaḥpa</i> <i>adeṇvikaḥpaḥ</i>	<i>kittva</i> <i>kitvaṃ</i>	[31] [32]
			<i>ha ya va ra la ṇ</i> <i>aśgrahṇe haśgrahṇe</i> <i>ca</i>	<i>ha ya va ra ṭ</i> <i>aḍgrahṇeṣv</i> <i>aśgrahṇeṣu</i>	[33]
			<i>ṇaṇaṇavāḥ syure</i> <i>kasmāc caturbhyas ca</i> <i>kacau ṇasau </i>	<i>ekasmān ṇaṇaṇavaṇā</i> <i>dvābhyām śastribhya</i> <i>eva kaṇamāḥ syuḥ </i>	[34]
			<i>dvābhyām jñeyau</i> <i>pañcabhyo rśmyaḥ</i> <i>ṣaḍbhyo las tu</i> <i>vidhīyate </i>	<i>jñeyau cayau caturb-</i> <i>hyo raḥ pañcabhyaḥ</i> <i>śalau ṣaḍbhyaḥ </i>	[34]

3. Analysis

3.1 Terminology

Generally, on the terminological level (cf. 2.1 and 2.2 “Other divergences”), the *Cāndravṛtti* seems to be more precise than the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

a) Concerning the words of common usage (cf. 2.1), one observes that when the different vocalic phonemes with which the *anubandha* is articulated have to be mentioned, the *Cāndravṛtti* uses *uccāraṇa*, a term that refers explicitly to the pronunciation, whereas the *Kāśikāvṛtti* resorts to *grahṇa*, a

a term with a wider extension, which is not related specifically to the articulation of sounds.⁵ Moreover, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *grahaṇa* in other contexts, like in [15], while the *Cāndravṛtti* employs the word *upādāna*. Another divergence concerning the vocabulary of common usage is to be noted: in [11], the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to *jñāpaka* “teaching, indication” where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *ācāra* “masters’ practice”. One may explain this divergence by the fact that Candra, the founder of his own school, does not have any authority to follow, unlike the authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: the word *ācāra* evokes, more frankly, the “weight” of the tradition or of a spiritual heritage, while from this viewpoint *jñāpaka* seems more neutral.

b) As for the technical vocabulary (cf. 2.2 “Other divergences”), several criteria can explain the choices of Candra and his commentator. It would seem that, in general, the *Cāndravṛtti* prefers a transparent or descriptive terminology⁶: one notes particularly the use of *ṇatva* (in [13]), of *ñamādeśa* (in [15])⁷ and of *yamādeśa* (in [15]), terms that correspond to *vināma*, *anunāsika* and *parasavarṇa* respectively in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.⁸ In addition to this transparency, some of the terms used in the *Cāndravṛtti* have a narrower extension than the terms to which the *Kāśikāvṛtti* resorts: *ṇatva*, for example, refers exclusively to the cerebralization of *n*, while *vināma* designates the cerebralization of both *n* and *s*. Another example is the expression *yamādeśa*, used instead of *parasavarṇa*: the former refers to a nasal substitute, whereas *parasavarṇa* designates any homogeneous phoneme. In other cases, the subtleties of the Pāṇinian analysis are obliterated in favour of generalization and, therefore, of simplification: the sequence *-ññ* in an utterance such as *udaññ āste* “he is seated in the northern direction” is described, in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, as the addition of an augment (*āgama*) identical with the final consonant of the previous

⁵ Otherwise, the term *grahaṇa* is used very frequently in Kātyāyana’s *vārttikas* and in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

⁶ Remember that the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* is presented as a term-less grammar: *candropajñam asaṃjñakam vyākaraṇam* (*Cāndravṛtti* on *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* 2.2.68).

⁷ The abbreviation *ñam* is already used in the *uṇādi-sūtras* (cf. Cardona 1976: 148). It is therefore an ancient grammatical term, not proper to Pāṇini.

⁸ Note, moreover, that the two technical terms *vināma* and *anunāsika* are known to be very ancient (cf. Renou 1942, 3rd part, s.v., and Abhyankar, 1961, s.v.), whereas the terms used by Candra and in the commentary appear with Pāṇini (like *parasavarṇa*) or even after him (like *ṇatva*).

word; Candra and his commentator consider the same sequence as a simple reduplication (*dve*, *dvitva*) of the consonant (cf. [23]). Likewise in [32], the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to the term *adeṇvikalpa* (lit. “option of |a|, |e| or |o|”) where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *kittva*; the phenomenon referred to here is the optional realization of *guṇa* vowels, conditioned by the presence of some suffixes optionally bearing the marker *k* (hence *k-ittva*): the expression *adeṇvikalpa* in the *Cāndravṛtti* simply mentions the optional realization of the *adeṇ* vowels, that is, it lays stress on the phenomenon itself, while the expression *kittvavikalpa* in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* refers to the optionality of the marker *k* with some suffixes, which conditions the realization of the *guṇa* vowels, thus emphasizing the cause of the phenomenon.⁹ These terminological choices, which are possible because of the absence of an authority to be respected,¹⁰ can be explained by the will of making Pāṇini’s grammar less ambiguous and more accessible.¹¹

However, it should be noted that this tendency to simplification is not systematic. For example, in [13] the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to the technical term *nuK* where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *nuḌ*. One may think that the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravṛtti* wanted to generalize the term *nuK* instead of using the three items *nuK*, *nuḌ* and *nuM*¹² found in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is not the case, though, for it appears that Candra and his commentator also resort to the two other terms.¹³

3.2 Examples

Below I give a table where all the examples quoted in both texts occur.¹⁴

⁹ See Translation, n. 54.

¹⁰ This fact, already mentioned, can equally explain the choice of a term such as *pratyāsannatara* in [16] where the *Kāśikā* uses *antarātama*, a usual term in the Pāṇinian tradition (cf. A. 1.1.50).

¹¹ It is interesting to notice that the *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa* of Devanandin (500 or 700 AD?), the oldest work of the Jain school of grammar known to us, which is also based on Pāṇini’s treatise, does not follow the same tendency as Candra. Instead of simplifying and clarifying the rules, Devanandin retains and even expands further the economy of expression (on this point, cf. Scharfe 1977: 168).

¹² These three terms designate three kinds of *n* infixes. For *nuK*, cf. e.g. A. 4.1.32, for *nuḌ*, cf. e.g. A. 7.1.54 and for *nuM*, cf. e.g. A. 7.1.58.

¹³ *nuḌ* occurs in C. 2.1.32 and C. 5.2.93 particularly; *nuM* occurs in C. 5.4.10 and following.

¹⁴ The order in which the examples of the table occur is identical with that of their quotation in the texts.

CV	KV	Localization
<i>kl̥ṣptaśikhah prakl̥ptaḥ kl̥pptavān</i>	<i>kl̥ṣptaśikhah prakl̥ptaḥ kl̥pptavān</i>	[7]
<i>ṛtaka ṭtaka</i>	<i>ṛtaka ṭtaka</i>	[8]
<i>prātar nayati nadihradaḥ</i>	<i>svaṛ nayati prātar nayati madrahradaḥ bhadrahradaḥ</i>	[15]
<i>naraṃ rathena</i>	<i>kuṇḍam rathena vanam rathena</i>	[15] [16]
	<i>uraḥ keṇa uraḥ keṇa uraḥ peṇa uraḥ peṇa</i>	[17]
	<i>śāṣṣyantā śāṣṣvatsara yatllokam tatllokam</i>	[20]
<i>snihitvā snehitvā aliksiṭ rudihī svapihī adāgdhām</i>	<i>snihitvā aliksiṭ rudihī svapihī adāgdhām</i>	[32]
	<i>mahā hi saḥ devā hasanti brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	[33]

I will start with two general observations:

1) only 3 of the 14 examples quoted in the *Cāndravṛtti* do not occur in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*;¹⁵

2) the *Kāśikāvṛtti* gives many more examples than the *Cāndravṛtti* (27 to 14).

These two tendencies characterize the whole section: the quasi-totality of what is said in the *Cāndravṛtti* occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and the *Cāndravṛtti* is less detailed than the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

¹⁵ As is shown in the Introduction, section 2.2.3 (h), the majority of the mss read both *snihitvā* and *snehitvā*. Thus, if one considers the majority reading, only 2 of the examples are not found.

a) The examples quoted in [7] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 19): *kl̥3ptaśikha, kl̥ptah, prakl̥ptah*. However, it should be noted that the item *kl̥pptavān* is missing in the *Mahābhāṣya* and that the item *kl̥ptah* does not occur in any of the texts studied here.

b) The examples quoted in [8] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 19): *aśaktyā kayācid brāhmaṇyā rtaka iti prayoktavya ltaka iti prayuktam | tasyānukaraṇam brāhmaṇy ltaka ity āha kumāry ltaka ity āheti*. Although the subject under discussion and the examples are the same, the form of the passage is slightly different in the *Mahābhāṣya* and in the two texts compared here.

c) Among the examples quoted in [15], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, pp. 27-28): *anunāsikasya. svar nayati prātar nayatīti* [...]; (vol. 1, p. 27): *dvirvacanasya. bhadrahradaḥ madrahrada iti* [...]. It is to be noted that the order in which the last two examples are quoted is not the same in the *Mahābhāṣya* and in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.¹⁶

d) Among the examples quoted in [15] and [16], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 28): *parasavar-nasya. kuṇḍam rathena. vanaṁ rathena*.

e) Among the examples quoted in [17], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 28): *kiṁ prayojanam. ṇatvam. uraḥ keṇa, uraḥ peṇa*.¹⁷

f) The examples quoted in [20] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 16): *tad yathā. saṃyāntā saṃvatsara yaḥllōkaṁ talllōkaṁ iti. anusvāraḥ sthānī yaṇam anunāsikaṁ prakalpayati*.

g) Among the examples quoted in [32], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 27): *yadi pūrvopadeśaḥ kittvaṁ vidheyam. snihitvā snehitvā. sisnihiṣati sisnehiṣati*. [...]. *ksavidhiḥ. ksaś ca vidheyah. adhuḥsat alikṣat*. [...]. *iḍvidhiḥ. iṭ ca vidheyah. rudihi svapihi*. [...]. *jhalgrahaṇāni ca*. [...]. *adāgdhām adāgdham*. It is to be noted that not all the examples given in the *Mahābhāṣya* appear in the two texts compared here.

h) Among the three examples quoted in [33], which occur only in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, the following are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 27): *ihāpi yathā syāt. mahā hi saḥ*. [...]. *ihāpi yathā syāt. puruṣo hasati. brāhmaṇo hasatīti*. It should be noticed that the example *devā hasanti*, quoted in the

¹⁶ F. Kielhorn (1880) mentions the following variant: L. 1 Ben. *madrahradaḥ bhadrahradaḥ*.

¹⁷ F. Kielhorn (1880) mentions the following variant: L. 21 *uraḥkeṇa urakeṇa. uraḥpeṇa urapeṇa*. The edition of Dr. Bal Shastri (2001, 6 vol.) selects the version with four examples.

Kāśikāvṛtti in order to show that *h* has to be included in the abbreviation *aś*,¹⁸ does not occur in the extract of the *Mahābhāṣya* quoted above (the two examples *puruṣo hasati* and *brāhmaṇo hasati* illustrate one and the same fact, which results from the application of the rule A. 6.1.114 *haśi ca*).

Conclusive remarks concerning the examples:

(1) in half of the cases (i.e. [8], [15], [16], [20]), the examples quoted by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* seem to be directly borrowed from the *Mahābhāṣya*;

(2) in the case of the examples occurring in [7], it is not impossible that the *Kāśikāvṛtti* based itself on the *Cāndravṛtti* or that both borrowed from a third source: the items are the same and are quoted in the same order. Likewise, in the case of section [32], not all the examples of the *Mahābhāṣya* have been preserved and one observes that both texts have selected the same items (concerning *snehitvā*, cf. Introduction, section 2.2.3 (h));

(3) among the four examples quoted in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* which do not occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (i.e. *kl̥p̥tavān*, *ura keṇa*, *ura peṇa* and *devā hasanti*), only one is quoted in the *Cāndravṛtti* (i.e. *kl̥p̥tavān*); in most cases, then, any hypothesis of borrowing from this text is excluded. In order to explain the examples *uraḥ keṇa* and *uraḥ peṇa*, one can invoke the use by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* of a version of the *Mahābhāṣya* where the four items *uraḥ keṇa*, *uraḥ keṇa*, *uraḥ peṇa* and *uraḥ peṇa* were quoted (cf. note 15). In order to explain the example *devā hasanti*, which does not seem to appear in any version of the *Mahābhāṣya*, one may wonder whether this is an innovation or a borrowing from a source other than the *Cāndravṛtti*.

3.3 Presence/absence of some sequences

The question is now to explain the presence or the absence of some sequences. My assumption is that the presence of a sequence can be explained by the problem(s) that it is supposed to solve (conversely, the absence of a sequence might indicate the absence of a problem to be solved).

¹⁸ It is only if *h* is included in *aś* that the rules A. 8.3.17 and A. 8.3.22 will apply. If so, one can obtain the form *devā hasanti*. In order to obtain the form *mahā hi saḥ*, *h* has to be included in *aṭ* (so that A. 8.3.9 and 8.3.3 will apply) and in *aś* (so that A. 8.3.17 and 8.3.22 will apply). Thus, the form *devā hasanti* does not really bring any new information, nor does it teach anything more than the form *mahā hi saḥ*.

Beginning of section [2]: the sentence *atha śabdānuśāsanam*, which is found only in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (and in all manuscripts, see Edition, p. 00), seems to be a direct borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya*. According to Kaiyaṭa,¹⁹ the purpose of this sentence is to inform about the direct or ultimate aim of grammar. Nāgeśa²⁰ specifies that the use of the word *atha* is explained by its auspicious character. As it is not really meant to solve a major problem, this may explain the absence of this sentence in the *Cāndravṛtti*.

The absence of the sequence *keṣāṃ śabdānām? laukikānām vaidikānām ca*²¹ in the *Cāndravṛtti* can be explained by the fact that Candra's grammar does not deal with Vedic words (or that it possibly dealt with them separately, in a lost section²²). If there is no alternative, this precision loses indeed its *raison d'être*. One will observe that the sequence *katham anu...lakṣaṇena* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, relating to the manner of imparting the teaching of words, does not occur verbatim in the *Paspaśā*.

Section [3]: the sequence *jātinirdeśaś cāyam* of the *Cāndravṛtti* (which occurs also in [14] and, in a slightly different form, in [17]), which is missing in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, could be a reformulation of the vārttika *ākṛtyupadeśāt siddham* (particularly *Paspaśā*, vol. 1, p. 75) "This (i.e. the teaching of all the phonemes including high-pitched, low-pitched, modulated, nasalized, long, trimoric) is realized because of the teaching of the generic form."²³ It is to be noted that this remark does not occur in the corresponding section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

Section [4]: the sentence sequence relating to the /a/ phoneme which occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*²⁴ does not occur in the *Cāndravṛtti*, probably for the following reason: the question of the degree of openness of the /a/ phoneme seems to be a typical topic of Prātiśākhya and Śikṣā works, technical treatises of the Vedic literature; thus, once again, if

¹⁹ Vol. 1, p. 3.

²⁰ Vol. 1, p. 5.

²¹ Which is also a borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya* (cf. *Paspaśā*, vol. 1, pp. 3 and 6).

²² On this point, see the first note of K.C. Chatterji, in his edition of the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* (p. 1).

²³ On the *ākṛtipakṣa* and the reasons for not accepting it, cf. Deshpande 1975: 17-31.

²⁴ The *Mahābhāṣya* also takes up the question of the opening of the /a/ phoneme, but the discussion is not worded in the same terms (cf. *Mahābhāṣya* on *a i u ṛ*, vol. 1, p. 79 ff.).

Candra does not deal with Vedic words, why should he refer to treatises relating to these words? Another fact that shows Candra's lack of interest in the degree of openness of /a/ is that there is no *sūtra* in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* corresponding to the last *sūtra* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (i.e. A. 8.4.68: *a a*).

Section [11]: the verse quoted in [11] recalls four vārttikas on *ha ya va ra Ṭ* (vol. 1, p. 144). On the use of the terms *ācārāt/jñāpakāt*, cf. 3.1.

Section [17]: the sequence *aṭām madhye... ṇatvaṃ yathā syād iti* in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* could be a slightly altered borrowing from the *vārttika* on vt. 6 ad *ha ya va ra Ṭ* (vol. 1, p. 133) or a borrowing from a third unknown source. This sequence deals with the teaching of the phonemes called *ayogavāha* (lit. "that which pulls without being harnessed", i.e. attested without being taught), namely *visarjanīya*, *jihvāmūlīya*, *upadhmānīya*, *anusvāra*, *anunāsikya* and *yama*. The vt. 6 stipulates that these units have to be taught between the psū 1 and 5 so that the *ṇ* substitute of *n* is realized after *r* or *ṣ*, also when a vowel, a semi-vowel or *ḥ* are inserted between them (cf. A. 8.4.2 and note 1, p. 291 in the French translation of P.-S. Filliozat, 1975). Thus, this passage partly concerns the organization of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (teaching of the *ayogavāha* phonemes in the psū section) and, if one excepts the *visarjanīya*, refers to phonetic facts which occur mostly in Vedic language (*jihvāmūlīya*, *upadhmānīya*), which may explain its absence from the *Cāndrāvṛtti*.

Section [20]: the sequence *saṃyāntā... yathā syād iti* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* may be a borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya*, vt. 3 on *a i u Ī* (vol. 1, p. 87). Here again, the mentioned facts occur mainly in Vedic.

Section [21]: the sequence *lakāre... laṇaratvam api bhavati* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is linked with the *guṇa* degree of /l/ (*laṇaratvam*), a very unusual phoneme, which occurs only in some forms of the verb *KṛP*. The little importance of this fact may easily explain its absence in the *Cāndrāvṛtti*.

Section [34]: the end of this sequence, which does not occur in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, refers to ancient grammars (*pūrvavyākaraṇeṣu*) especially to the *Phīṣsūtra* of Sāntanava. The *Phīṣsūtra*, which is probably post-Pāṇinian, gives rules for the accentuation of nominal bases according to their phonologic shape and their meaning. This reference to the work of Sāntanava indicates that Candra resorted to this source, though dedicated to accentuation, a language feature that is found mainly in Vedic. This seems to confirm

the hypothesis according to which Candra has really dealt with Vedic facts, but in a separate (and lost) section.

If the *Kāśikāvṛtti* does not mention this sequence, it is probably because it does not take the *Phīṣūtra* into account and, therefore, the equivalence between *aṣ* and *aC* is not relevant for it.

One may notice, then, that there are two main reasons to explain the presence of several sequences in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and their absence in the *Cāndravṛtti*: 1) these sequences, like section [20], refer to linguistic facts belonging to Vedic; 2) these sequences, like section [17], refer to facts peculiar to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

3.4 Conclusive remarks

One notes that, for the concerned section, the content of the *Cāndravṛtti* occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* in its quasi entirety: the only sequence of the *Cāndravṛtti* that does not appear in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is the end of the final sequence, which refers to the *Pratyāhārasūtras* of ancient grammars and quotes rules of the *Phīṣūtra*. Here too, then, there is a strong similarity between the two texts. Could this constitute a solid argument to prove the influence of the *Cāndravṛtti* on the *Kāśikāvṛtti*? I am not completely convinced of that. The main reason is that the similarity of the two texts for the concerned section does not invalidate the hypothesis according to which both texts borrowed from a third source. Where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* deviates from the *Mahābhāṣya* and seems to draw closer to the *Cāndravṛtti* —as, for instance, in the case of the examples of sections [7] and [32]— nothing forbids to think that it does not borrow from the *Cāndravṛtti*, but from another source on which the *Cāndravṛtti* is also based. Moreover, if the *Kāśikāvṛtti* has mainly drawn its inspiration from the *Cāndravṛtti*, from what source does it draw the example *devā hasanti* in section [33]?

The observations presented in this paper would certainly be more consistent if the *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa* were provided with a *Pratyāhārasūtra* section; unfortunately, this is not the case for the version which has come down to us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- CANDRAGOMIN, *Candra-vṛtti, der original Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra. Herausgegeben von Bruno Liebich*, 1918. Abhandlungen fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes 14, Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendeln, Leipzig 1966.
- *Cāndravvyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Edited by K.C. Chatterji, 2 vols., Deccan College, Poona 1953.
- KAIYAṬA, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣyam with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Pratibha Prakashan, Delhi.
- JAYADITYA AND VĀMANA, *Kāśikāvṛtti of*, the edition used in this paper is the critical edition presented in this book.
- NĀGEŚA, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Pratibha Prakashan, Delhi.
- PĀNINI, *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Roman transliteration and English translation by S.M. Katre, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989.
- PATAÑJALI, *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by Franz Kielhorn, 1880. Third edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by K.V. Abhyankar, vol. 1, The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1962.
- *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣyam with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Pratibha Prakashan, Delhi.

Studies

- ABHYANKAR, Koshinath Vasudev (1961), *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, The Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- BALBIR, Nalini (2000), "Candragomin ou Candra", in *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques* (tome 2), Hors-Série H.E.L., Société d'Histoire et d'Epistémologie des Sciences du Langage, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Paris, pp. 270-72.
- BRONKHORST, Johannes (2002), "The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: Some Questions", in Deshpande, M.M., Hook, P.E.

- (Eds.), *Indian Linguistic Studies. Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, pp. 182-201.
- CARDONA, Georges (1976), *Pāṇini. A survey of research*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- DASH, Prafulla Chandra (1980), "Candra and the 'asaṃjñāka vyākaraṇa'", Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit – Studies 5, Poona, pp. 187-97.
- (1986), *A Comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar (Kṛdanta portion)*, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, New Delhi.
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. (1975), *Critical Studies in Indian Grammarians I. The Theory of Homogeneity [Sāvarṇya]*, Michigan Series in South and Southeast Asian Languages and Linguistics, Ann Arbor.
- DEVASTHALI, G.V. (1967), *The Phīṣṣūtras of Śāntanava*, University of Poona, Poona.
- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain (1975), *Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali avec le Pradīpa de Kaiyaṭa et l'Uddyota de Nāgeśa – Adhyāya 1, Pāda 1, Āhnika 1-4*. Traduction par P.-S. Filliozat, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- JOSHI, Shiva Dattatreya, ROODBERGEN, J.A.F. (1991-1992), "Evidence in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* for an Authentic Pāṇinian Tradition Independent of Patañjali", *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute*, 51-52, pp. 131-35.
- OBERLIES, Thomas (1996), "Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der *Cāndra-Vṛtti* zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravāyākaraṇa III)", *Festschrift Paul Thieme, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 20, pp. 265-317.
- (2006), "Zum Sūtrapāṭha des Cāndravāyākaraṇa (Studien zum Cāndravāyākaraṇa IV)", in von Hüsken, U., Kieffer-Pülz, P., Peters, A. (Eds.), *Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, Marburg, pp. 379-95.
- RENOU, Louis (1942), *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit* (3 parts), E. Champion, Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, Paris.
- SCHARFE, Harmut (1977), *Grammatical Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Collection A History of Indian Literature, ed. by J. Gonda, vol. V, fasc. 2, Wiesbaden.
- VEDALANKAR, Raghuvir (1977), *Kāśikā kā samālocanātmak adhyayan [A Critical Study of the Kāśikā]*, Nag Publishers, Delhi.

- VISALAKSHY, P. (1981), “The influence of Cāndra and Kātantra Grammars on *Kāśikāvṛtti*”, Vishveshwaranand Indo-logical Journal 19, pp. 45-49.